

COMMITTEE ON RESEARCH (COR)**Wednesday, November 5, 2014****3:00 – 4:30 pm****KL 360****[UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources](#)**

- I. **Guests - Susan Carter, Thea Vicari, Autumn Salazar, and Susan Borda 3:00 – 3:30**
Susan Carter, Director of Research Development Services; Thea Vicari, Director of Sponsored Projects Services; Autumn Salazar, Director of Research Accounting Services, and Susan Borda, Project Manager, Office of Research.
Discussion: new grants management system.

- II. **Chair's Report – David Noelle**
Updates from Division Council meeting on November 5

- III. **Vice Chair's Report – Deborah Wiebe**
Updates from UCOLASC meeting on October 31

- IV. **Consent Calendar**
Approval of October 15 meeting minutes. **Pg. 1-6**

- V. **Preliminary ORU Proposal**
Background: at the last meeting, COR discussed a request it received from a unit in SSHA to provide preliminary feedback on a strategic academic focusing proposal. The unit intends to convert the document into an ORU proposal. COR agreed to provide comments with the caveat that feedback will be brief and does not constitute Senate approval. A COR member volunteered to lead the review.

Proposal can be viewed on page 3 of the SFI portal website: <http://open-proposals.ucsf.edu/ucmerced/saf2020/proposal/12000>

Action: COR lead reviewer will present comments. COR will transmit a memo to the proposing unit along with the approved versions of the SNRI and HSRI ORU proposals.

VI. Library Issues**Pg. 7-15**

Background: in AY 13-14 the Senate-Administration Library Working Group recommended to the Provost/EVC and Senate Chair that Merced establish a standing Senate committee on library and scholarly communications similar to that of other UC campuses. Division Council will vote on this proposed new committee this academic year. Library issues are currently submitted to COR for consideration. Recently, faculty members in SSHA expressed concern that due to the Library's lack of adequate funding, the Library cannot acquire many needed hard copy volumes nor can it provide access to many e-books.

Discussion: COR to discuss possible solutions.

VII. Senate Faculty Grants Program**Pg. 16-26**

Discussion: continued discussion on program goals. In the last meeting, COR members agreed to review the university-wide principles, drafted in June 2012, that guide UCOP-funded research programs. These principles will aid COR in drafting its memo to the Provost/EVC that details the long-term goals of the Senate faculty grants program and the needed for additional funding.

Other relevant background documents, including the previous awardees, proposals, and calls, as well as information from the other UC campuses, are posted at:

UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Faculty research grants

VIII. Systemwide Review Items**A. Proposed Revisions to APM 133, 210, 220, and 760**

Major revisions include expanded reasons for requesting a stop to the eight-year tenure clock and the additional criterion of contributions to diversity for use in personnel reviews. CAP and FWDAF are lead reviewers. All comments are due to Senate Chair by November 21, 2014.

Revisions are available on UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Review Items - Systemwide

B. Proposed Revisions to APM 80 and 330

Major revisions include procedures surrounding medical separation and the clarification of the definition, criteria, and terms of employment for those in the Specialist series. CAP and FWDAF are lead reviewers. All comments are due to Senate Chair by November 21, 2014.

Revisions are available on UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Review Items - Systemwide

C. Proposed Amendment to Senate Regulation 682

The proposed amendment would allow individual graduate divisions to decide the timeframe for advancement to candidacy for Master's degree students. All comments are due to Senate Chair by January 6, 2015.

Revisions are available on UCMCROPS/COR1415/Resources/Review Items – Systemwide

IX. Other Business

X. Informational Item

- A. The December 3 COR meeting will include Vice Chancellor for Business & Administrative Services Michael Reese, AVC for Budget & Planning Donna Jones, and Controller Michael Riley, who will provide updates on the indirect cost return model and emergency funding for faculty.

Committee on Research (COR)
Minutes of Meeting
October 15, 2014

Pursuant to call, the Committee on Research met at 3:00 pm on October 15, 2014 in Room 324 of the Kolligian Library, Chair David C. Noelle presiding.

I. Chair's Report

Chair Noelle updated COR members on the following:

--CAPRA meeting on October 8:

The Provost/EVC met with CAPRA to discuss space and resource issues. His slide presentation from the September 24 all-faculty forum has now been widely distributed. The Provost/EVC informed CAPRA that the five thematic research areas are broad and he requested input from the faculty on narrowing them down. The CAPRA chair asked for a clarification of the role of CAPRA in the strategic academic focusing process and this will be an ongoing discussion.

When asked about the space issues now and until 2020, the Provost/EVC pointed out that that space is tied to enrollment and there is no plan to establish more space after the next building is finished. The Provost/EVC asked whether there is an imminent crisis with graduate student space. He has tasked the school deans with determining the space in their buildings in an effort to find more space on campus for research needs. Lastly, the Provost/EVC related that he is optimistic about the public/private partnerships.

--Division Council meeting on October 8:

The Senate Chair and Vice Chair held a meeting with the Provost/EVC and topics included opportunity hires, a task force on medical education at Merced, and a debriefing on the systemwide Senate chairs' retreat which included a discussion on building relationships with the national laboratories and establishing additional research stations.

Division Council approved the draft charge of the proposed Senate-IT Advisory Council as well SSHA's request to suspend the use of the appraisal form.

Standing committee reports included a statement from the CRE chair about possibly producing a standardized conflict of interest statement for the Division, a debrief from the CAPRA chair about the earlier meeting with the Provost/EVC, updates from the GC chair on revising the graduate advisor's handbook and drafting policies and procedures for graduate groups, and a statement from the FWDAF chair that his committee is working on diversity in recruitment, faculty salary equity reports, and is collaborating with the Academic Personnel office on the monthly, junior faculty professional development workshops.

Vice Chancellor for Business and Administrative Services Michael Reese attended at the request of Division Council and stated that some of the problems with the renewal of parking permits this semester occurred because of the unknown status of the construction sites and whether planned works would take place on established parking lots. Division Council members expressed their concerns with the lack of communication. VC Reese requested additional faculty members on the TAPS advisory committee.

--UCORP meeting on October 13:

Some campuses are over-enrolling non-resident tuition students. It was mentioned that UCOP might place a cap on the percentage of these students but it is unknown whether UCOP would specify a cap on the number of these students or if each campus would institute its own cap.

Former Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP Steven Beckwith previously expressed concern about multicampus research units' (MRU) funding needs. Later, through the multicampus research programs and initiatives (MRPI) program, proposals were placed in a peer-review

funding competition. The Portfolio Review Group (PRG), the committee comprised of representatives from across the system and tasked with reviewing the funding for MRPIs, came to an agreement last year on what should be cut from these programs. UCORP was concerned as the money that was cut was not redistributed to research projects. The systemwide Senate chair sent a letter to UCOP, explaining the extent to which MRPI budgets were cut and advocated for a promise from President Napolitano that a fixed fraction of the systemwide research budget be allocated to faculty-driven initiatives, namely, the MRPI program. The \$2.61 million in additional funds given to MRPI was only intended to fulfill current obligations. There was discussion at UCORP about whether MRPI should be included in the systemwide compendium; previously, UCORP was against this idea because MRPI should remain flexible.

President Napolitano has introduced a focus on innovation and has formed an innovation council to formulate ideas on how the UC can benefit. Some members of UCORP expressed concern about the commercialization of research and pointed out the considerations of intellectual property issues. Moreover, there are already tech transfer policies and procedures in place and some faculty do not advocate creating a new mechanism. The President's innovation council contains no faculty or administrators - they are primarily venture capitalists and other business-related individuals. (The systemwide Senate chair is now allowed to observe the council meetings but cannot take action.) The Regents approved \$250 million for "UC Ventures" to be used on startups that originate from UC research projects. There are issues about open access with the tech transfer individuals.

A request for proposals will be submitted in spring 2015 for \$14 million in awards for research involving national laboratories. Funds will be allocated for graduate students who do their dissertation with a lab.

President Napolitano will distribute \$10 million to programs on sustainability, food, community (equity) research, and health care.

UCORP would like a permanent replacement for former VP Beckwith. However, UCOP is currently undergoing a review and wants to delay hiring a replacement. President Napolitano expressed her interest in replacing VP Beckwith with a director of innovation but this was met with concern that faculty-driven research may suffer. The systemwide Senate plans to send a communication about the proposal to establish this new position.

VCR Traina informed COR members that MRPI review will occur at the end of this month. The two-stage process involves an external review group representing five programmatic areas that will rank the proposals for technical excellence. In early November, a portfolio review will examine the final proposals and make recommendations to the systemwide Provost based on the previously-stated goals of the PRG.

Other topics of interest at the October 13 UCORP meeting include a systemwide inventory cataloging of chemicals and ongoing concerns about animal rights activists. UCOP is deciding how it can best protect animal researchers.

II. Consent Calendar

The October 1 meeting minutes were approved as presented.

III. SNRI Five Year Review

In a previous meeting, VCR Traina planned on submitting a notification letter to SNRI. In today's meeting, Traina informed COR that the newly-created program review and oversight committee (PROC) wants to discuss the review process further before SNRI is notified of the five-year review. VCR Traina expects that SNRI's self-study will be completed this year, but external review will likely occur in fall 2015.

IV. ORU Proposal

A unit on campus has asked for COR's preliminary input on the proposal it submitted through the campus strategic academic focusing process. The unit intends to transform the proposal into a formal ORU proposal and has requested COR's review in advance. After a brief discussion, COR members

agreed to review the proposal as long as it is made clear to the unit that COR's feedback is informal and does not represent Senate approval.

ACTION: At the next meeting, COR will review the proposal and draft comments. The comments will be transmitted to the unit in addition to copies of the previously-approved SNRI and HSRI ORU proposals as an example of successful ORU proposals.

V. Limited Submission Proposals

In a previous meeting, COR agreed that faculty would like increased transparency in the campus limited submission proposal process. VCR Traina, to whom the request for transparency would be submitted, summarized the review process: each school is asked to nominate the maximum number of proposals allowed for the campus (recommendations come from the school deals), an ad hoc faculty review team is then assembled for each proposal, and finally, the team makes recommendations to VCR Traina. Traina then informs the authors of the winning proposals. VCR Traina mentioned that his office will be acquiring software that would make the proposal reviewing process more efficient. The winning proposals will also be posted on his website.

ACTION: VCR Traina will send COR a statement summarizing the limited submission proposal process. COR will review and make recommendations.

VI. Systemwide Review Item

Senate standing committees were asked to review the proposed revisions to APM 133, 210, 220, and 760. Significant changes include additional reasons to stop the eight-year tenure clock, and, an increased importance of contributions to diversity in the personnel review process.

ACTION: The Senate Chair will be informed that COR has no comments.

VII. Faculty Research Grants Program

COR members continued their discussion on the future of the faculty research grants program. A three-step process was agreed upon: 1) decide what the ideal future for this program would be, 2) submit a letter to the Provost/EVC to convey that the program was not well funded in the past, but an investment is greatly needed, and lastly, 3) determine the criteria for the AY 14-15 process (a call for proposals should be submitted in early spring).

COR members continued to debate the goals of the grants program and agreed that funding could be allocated to various tiers of eligibility. The priorities that the COR wants to focus on are “juniority” of PI, evidence of need, new research initiatives, potential for attracting extramural funding, and travel for the dissemination of research.

ACTION: COR members to use the PRG principles as a guide for drafting the memo to the Provost/EVC. COR analyst to determine the amount of funding other campuses allocate for their annual faculty grants program. This discussion will continue at the November 5 meeting.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 4:30 pm.

Attest: David C. Noelle, COR Chair

Minutes prepared by: Simrin Takhar, Senate Analyst

Academic Senate-Administration Library Working Group Final Report

The Academic Senate-Administration Library Working Group (LWG) met three times during the 2013 Fall Semester to address the items in its charge. In addition, the LWG solicited comments from stakeholders from the faculty, student body, and administration.

The LWG reached consensus on two matters. First, the library is an academic unit and the library budget needs to grow significantly in order to reflect past growth at UC Merced and to keep pace with continued growth. The current budget is not adequate to meet the diverse requirements for print and digital information and scholarly communication at a research university, nor to address inflation in scholarly information costs. Second, the LWG strongly supports the creation of a permanent Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee with a membership and charge akin to such committees at other UC campuses (see Appendix A). The Library and Scholarly Information Advisory Committee should be charged with addressing the major library issues and potential directions that the LWG surfaced, which include:

Budget

- How, and how much, to grow the library budget and staff to support all areas of activity as the campus adds faculty, students, and new programs.
- Potential budget impacts of open-access publishing, cost inflation of scholarly information, and changing models for acquiring and accessing information.

Space and Infrastructure

- Library public spaces are being used at maximum capacity.
- Space for printed books. There is sufficient stack space to get to 2020, but space needs for 2030 and beyond are uncertain.
- There is not enough space for physical non-book materials to get to 2020, such as manuscripts, university archives, art work, and realia.
- There is a need for digital labs and workspaces, staff and network/hardware infrastructure for digital collaboration and for activities such as data curation. Campus core facilities with missions synergistic to the library (e.g. digital humanities, spatial analysis) could be located in the library.
- Possible solutions include (re)claiming space in Kolligian Library Building or creating library common spaces in new buildings.

Non-Commodity Information

- Non-commodity information is any campus-generated information (physical or digital) for which the campus or individual researchers retain or are granted usage rights.
- Assist researchers in handling non-commodity content through the entire lifecycle of collection, digitization, design, analysis, sharing, discovery, and archiving.

- Management of digital and physical non-commodity information produced as the result of research, instruction, or campus initiatives to digitize and/or preserve non-university information.

Educational Role

- Develop research-ready students (undergraduate and graduate) who have the skills to discover, access, evaluate, and apply information throughout their scholarly, professional, civic, and personal lives.
- Identify and acquire core print and digital collections that are adequate and systematic in coverage and appropriate to student learning and research in all disciplines and at all levels from general education through Ph.D.
- Respond to newly enhanced WASC requirements for information-literacy outcomes and provide in-person and online information-literacy instruction.
- Provide library support for online courses as they emerge.

Research Role

- Support campus research by developing mechanisms to identify collection needs and by providing access to adequate and comprehensive print and digital resources appropriate to all disciplines at the university, as well as aiding in managing the non-commodity information (data, print, other formats) produced by university researchers.
- The growth of the library staff should reflect the expertise needed to support faculty and student research and publication in all forms and disciplines.
- The library itself could be studied by researchers interested in organizational management, economics, educational outcomes, etc.
- The library should be a partner in research projects that would benefit from librarian input and expertise.

Library and Scholarly Communication Advisory Committee

We propose the establishment of a Senate standing committee, the Library and Scholarly Communication Advisory Committee (LSCAC). We believe that a free-standing LSCAC will best meet the needs of the campus, since the issues that such a committee will address are unique to this domain, and since the ex officio membership of this committee will not overlap with that of other standing committees. However, if it proves difficult to staff a free-standing LSCAC, we note that it would be feasible to make the LSCAC charge a part of the Committee on Research charge (as at UC Irvine, see Appendix A), presumably with the LSCAC a semi-autonomous subcommittee of CoR. We note further that LSCAC will generally need to meet only once or twice per semester.

The LSCAC will, of course, aid the library by serving as a two-way conduit for mutual exchanges of information and ideas between the library and its stakeholders. In keeping with such committees on other UC campuses, the committee will advise the Chancellor regarding administration of the Library, and, in accordance with the

Standing Orders of the Regents, advise the University Librarian regarding acquisition, storage and provision of library holdings; and to perform such other duties relative to the Library as may be committed to the Senate by proper authority. The committee will participate with the University Librarian in matters relating to the library budget, the formulation of library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds; and will prepare and submit to the Division an annual report on financial problems, allocation of space, facilities for research, and any other matters within its jurisdiction. The LSCAC will also advise the library on matters of importance to the university community, and will liaise with the CIO on matters related to research computing. Finally, the LSCAC will study and report on issues of scholarly communication, including technology, publishing, teaching, archiving, and copyright. The LSCAC promotes education and advocacy for matters concerning the library and scholarly communication.

The proposed membership of the LSCAC is as follows:

- Faculty member representing the Academic Senate Committee on Research
- Faculty member representing School of Social Sciences, Humanities, and Arts
- Faculty member representing School of Natural Sciences
- Faculty member representing School of Engineering
- Librarian representing the Librarians Association of the University of California—Merced Division
- University Librarian (ex officio)
- Vice Chancellor for Research (ex officio)
- Chief Information Officer (ex officio)
- Representative of the Graduate Student Association
- Representative of the Associated Students of the University of California, Merced
- Vice Provost and Dean of Undergraduate Education (ex officio)

APPENDIX A

University of California Library Advisory Structures

<p>UC Berkeley</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Library Committee</p> <p>Membership: This Committee has two student members (one graduate, one undergraduate); number of Senate members not specified. 2013-2014 Library Committee has 11 faculty members plus University Librarian “by invitation.”</p> <p>Charge:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Advises the Chancellor regarding administration of the Library; and• Performs such other duties relative to the Library as may be committed to the Division. <p>http://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/committees/libr</p>
<p>UC Davis</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Library Committee</p> <p>Membership: This committee shall consist of at least ten members, including the following: one undergraduate student representative; one graduate student representative; one representative appointed by the Davis Academic Federation; the chair of the library committee of each college or school having a library committee on the Davis campus; a faculty member from each college or school on the Davis campus that does not have a library committee but does have a committee with responsibility for library matters; and the University Librarian of the Davis campus ex-officio. (Am. 3/16/92; 10/20/97)</p> <p>Charge: It shall be the duty of this committee to advise the Chief Campus Officer regarding the administration of the Library on the Davis campus, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents, to advise the University Librarian regarding removal and storage of library holdings, and to perform such other duties relative to the Library as may be committed to the Senate by proper authority. The committee shall report at least once a year to the Representative Assembly. (Am. 6/10/93; effective 1/1/94)</p> <p>http://academicsenate.ucdavis.edu/committees/committee-list/library.cfm</p>
<p>UC Irvine</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Council on Research Computing and Libraries</p> <p>Membership: The Council on Research, Computing, and Libraries shall consist of at least one member</p>

from each Faculty and no more than one member from any academic department. To balance the responsibilities of service among the members, each of the following Faculties shall have the following number of members:

- 1) Biological Sciences (2 members), Health Sciences (2 members);
- 2) Physical Sciences (2 members), Engineering (2 members), ICS (1 member);
- 3) The Arts (1 member), Humanities (2 members); Education (1 member); and
- 4) Social Sciences (2 members), Social Ecology (1 member), Business (1 member), Law (1 member).

The Vice Chancellor for Research, the Associate Vice Chancellor of Information Technology, and the University Librarian shall be ex officio non-voting members.

Charge:

- (1) Consider issues pertaining to fostering research.
- (2) Advise the Chancellor and represent the Division on matters relating to research policy and administration and academic resources, including information technology, telecommunications, and library policies and administration on the Irvine campus.
- (3) Administer general campus funds for faculty research and review and evaluate University-recognized research programs and units.
- (4) Advise the Vice Chancellor for Research on campus nominees or applicants for research awards from foundations and other granting agencies which restrict the number of proposals submitted.
- (5) Represent the Division on the University Committee on Research Policy, the University Committee on Library & Scholarly Communication, and the University Committee on Computing & Communications
- (6) A designated library representative shall be responsible for maintaining Council liaison with the University Librarian, and with any library committees that may exist in any of the Faculties.

Activities of CORCL should take into consideration the university's mission to promote diversity.

<http://www.senate.uci.edu/Councils/CORCL/index.asp>

UCLA

Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication

Membership:

Nine voting faculty appointed by the Committee on Committees and confirmed by the Legislative Assembly for up to 3 years,
The UCLA University Librarian, ex-officio,
Two student representatives, 1 undergraduate and 1 graduate appointed by their respective student government.

Charge:

The Committee on Library and Scholarly Communication (COLASC) takes, as its principal obligation, to reflect and articulate the views of UCLA faculty members concerning the role

of the University Library in the acquisition, storage, and provision of scholarly materials.

COLASC advises the Chancellor concerning the administration of the Library and scholarly communication. The Committee represents the Division and the faculty in all matters of library policy and advises the Library administration accordingly. COLASC meets twice per quarter

Interactions with Administration:

Primary interactions are with the University Librarian.

<http://www.senate.ucla.edu/committees/library/>

UC Riverside

Library & Scholarly Communication

Membership:

This committee consists of seven members of the Division, including the University librarian of the Riverside campus, ex officio. The Chair normally also serves on the University Library Committee.

Charge:

It is the duty of this committee to:

- (1) Advise the President and the Chancellor regarding the administration of the library and matters concerning scholarly communication at Riverside in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents and perform such other duties relative to the library as may be referred by proper authority;
- (2) Participate with the librarian in matters relating to the library budget, the formulation of library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds;
- (3) Provide liaison between the Faculty and the library administration in all matters of library policy;
- (4) Prepare and submit to the Division an annual report on financial problems, allocation of space, facilities for research, and any other matters within its jurisdiction;
- (5) Participate in an advisory capacity in the appointment of the librarian.

<http://senate.ucr.edu/committee/?do=info&id=15>

UC San Diego

Library

Membership:

This committee shall consist of seven ordinary members of the Division, including ex officio the University Librarian at San Diego, who shall not become chair. It shall also have one representative of the Librarians Association of University of California, one undergraduate student representative, and one graduate student representative, who shall not have the right to vote. One member shall also serve on the University Library Committee.

Charge:

The Library Committee shall have the following duties:

- (1) It shall advise the President of the University and the Chancellor at San Diego regarding the administration of the Library at San Diego [see 105.2(f) of the Standing Orders of The Regents]. Such advice shall include recommendations concerning the Library budget, the formulation of Library policies, the allocation of space, and the apportionment of funds.
- (2) It shall perform such other duties relative to the Library at San Diego as may be committed to the Division by proper authority.
- (3) It shall provide liaison between the faculty and the Library administration in all matters of Library policy.
- (4) It shall prepare and submit to the Division an annual report on financial problems, allocation of space, facilities for research in campus libraries, and any other matters within its jurisdiction.
- (5) It shall participate in an advisory capacity to the Chancellor at San Diego and the President of the University preliminary to the appointment of the University Librarian.

<http://senate.ucsd.edu/committees/library.htm>

UC San Francisco

Library & Scholarly Communication

Membership:

This Committee shall consist of ten members, including the University Librarian of the San Francisco Division, a representative of the Librarians Association of the University of California - San Francisco Division (LAUC-SF), and one representative from either the UCSF Graduate Student Association or Associated Students of the University of California, San Francisco as ex officio members. The student representative groups shall in alternate years provide representatives (in odd years – GSA, in even years – ASUCSF), with each group serving to coordinate and communicate matters of importance relative to the Library on behalf of both groups. In the event that the Student Associations are unable to alternate representation, they shall determine amongst themselves which organization will send representation.

Charge:

- (1) To advise the President and the Chancellor regarding the administration of the library at San Francisco, in accordance with the Standing Orders of The Regents, and perform such duties relative to the Libraries at San Francisco as may be assigned to the Division by proper authority.
- (2) To provide liaison between Faculty and Library Administration on all matters of library policy.
- (3) To participate with the University Librarian on matters relating to library budget formulation policy and the allocation of space and apportionment of funds.
- (4) To prepare and submit to the San Francisco Division an annual report on financial problems, allocation of space, facilities for Library research and any other matters within its jurisdiction.

http://senate.ucsf.edu/committee/index.php?committee_id=10

UC Santa Barbara

Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources

(The Committee on Library, Information, & Instructional Resources functions as a subcommittee of the Council on Research and Instructional Resources.)

Membership:

Committee on Library, Information & Instructional Resources consisting of a Chair and five (5) Council members. The University Librarian and Associate Vice Chancellor of Academic Programs serve ex-officio;

Charge:

Acts for the Division in all matters of Library policy and administration and advises the Chancellor and the Division accordingly; reviews and makes recommendations concerning the print, electronic, space and growth needs of the Library; participates in administrative reviews of the Library and formulates recommendations to the Chancellor, the Division and the Council on Planning and Budget as appropriate.

<https://senate.ucsb.edu/~councils.and.committees/index.cfm?V=F996622685347CB78BE C86C39837969D>

UC Santa Cruz

Committee on the Library and Scholarly Communication

Membership:

There are five Santa Cruz Division members, plus the University Librarian at Santa Cruz serving ex officio. In addition, there are no more than two student representatives. The Chair and Chair-elect of the UCSC Librarians Association are invited to sit with the Committee. The University Librarian does not serve as Chair.

Charge:

- 1) The Committee advises the President of the University and the Chancellor at Santa Cruz regarding the administration of the libraries at Santa Cruz, in accordance with the Standing Orders of the Regents. It consults with campus and library administration on local and Universitywide library and scholarly communication policies. Scholarly communication refers to the modalities by which research and creative work are made public, as described in 13.23.4. Whenever appropriate, the Committee joins the library administration in providing representation at Universitywide discussions of library policy. It assists the library administration in determining acquisition and management policies for collections, considering changing patterns of faculty and student use of the library, and the varied needs of the different disciplines.
- 2) In consultation with the University Librarian, the Committee advises the Chancellor

and the Committee on Planning and Budget on the library budget, apportionment of funds, allocation of space, and other matters concerning the library. Advises and consults with the Chancellor on administrative reviews of the library.

- 3) The Committee studies and reports on issues of scholarly communication, including technology, publishing, teaching, archiving, and copyright. The Committee promotes education and advocacy for matters concerning the library and scholarly communication.

<http://senate.ucsc.edu/committees/colasc-committee-on-library-and-scholarly-communication/index.html>

California Digital Library

Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Committee

The Systemwide Library and Scholarly Information Committee was established to advise the University on systemwide library policies and strategic priorities, on systemwide long term planning for the UC libraries including the ten campus libraries and the California Digital Library (CDL), and on strategies to enhance and facilitate the transmission of scholarly and scientific communication in a digital environment.

SLASIAC Membership and Charge:

http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/groups/files/slasiac/docs/SLASIAC_charge_revised_final_111411.pdf

<http://libraries.universityofcalifornia.edu/slasiac>

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

TASK FORCE ON UNIVERSITY-WIDE RESEARCH PRINCIPLES, PROCESSES AND ASSESSMENT

REPORT TO THE VICE PRESIDENT OF RESEARCH AND GRADUATE STUDIES

JUNE 2012

BACKGROUND AND INTRODUCTION

In Fall 2011, the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies convened a Task Force on the University-wide Research Principles, Processes and Assessment (PPA Task Force) and charged the group with examining the current principles and processes that guide UCOP-funded research programs, and recommending a comprehensive framework to guide future decision-making and assessment of UCOP research investments. The task force was charged with re-examining the purpose of investing in universitywide research, the principles that guide those investments, the processes for decision making and evaluation, and the objectives and measures we use to evaluate research investments when considering whether or not to initiate or continue funding. The task force was asked specifically to set aside examinations of any specific programs, projects, or areas of research.

The PPA Task Force was a joint effort between UCOP, Academic Senate and campus administration. Membership was comprised of representatives from the Office of the President, and the full membership of the University Committee on Research Policy (UCORP) and the Council of Vice Chancellors for Research (COVCR). The task force was convened in late fall of 2011 and took several months to discuss these complex and difficult questions. Monthly discussions were held together as a group (by videoconference), as well as within the monthly meetings of the constituent subgroups which comprised our membership (UCORP, COVCR). A drafting workgroup was formed, with representatives from each constituent subgroup (UCOP, UCORP and COVCR) to help put words to the ideas of the group and produce draft proposals and recommendations for consideration and refinement by the greater task force membership.

The PPA Task Force is pleased to transmit the following report to the Vice President in response to its original charge. These recommendations reflects a good deal of work, discussion and debate over several months, not only among task force members, but also among the staff at the Office of the President who supported this work, and the many individuals from the campus research community who provided advice and input.

The task force appreciates the opportunity to provide input on a topic of such importance to the health of the University of California. We hope that our collective efforts will achieve lasting and effective change in the ways we envision, implement and assess the research investments we make together as a University.

PPA Task Force

JUNE 2012

PPA TASKFORCE MEMBERS:

Co-Chairs:

John Crawford, Chair of the University Committee on Research Policy

Jenny Gautier, Deputy to the Vice President of Research and Graduate Studies

Council of Vice Chancellors for Research:

Graham Fleming, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Berkeley

Harris Lewin, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Davis

John Hemminger, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Irvine

James Economou, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Los Angeles

Sam Traina, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Merced

Charles Louis, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Riverside

Sandra Brown, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC San Diego

Susanne Hildebrande-Zanki, Associate Vice Chancellor for Research, UC San Francisco

Michael Witherell, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Santa Barbara

Bruce Morgan, Vice Chancellor for Research, UC Santa Cruz

David Clark, Los Alamos National Laboratory

Edward Turano, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory

John Knezovich, Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

University Committee on Research Policy:

Michael Kleeman, Vice Chair, UCORP

Michael Tarter, UC Berkeley

Leslea Hlusko, UC Berkeley (alternate)

Sally McKee, UC Davis

Hugh Roberts, UC Irvine (Fall 2011, Spring 2012)

James Brody, UC Irvine (Winter 2012)

Timoth Tangherlini, UC Los Angeles

Mike Cleary, UC Merced

Robert Clare, UC Riverside

Frank Wuerthwein, UC San Diego

Shlomo Dubnov, UC San Diego (alternate)

Ralph Marcucio, UC San Francisco

Srikantan Nagarajan, UC San Francisco (alternate)

Jianwen Su, UC Santa Barbara

Scott Oliver, UC Santa Cruz

Greg Wiley, Graduate Student Representative

Sabrina-Anne Wu, Undergraduate Student Representative

UC Office of the President:

Michael Reese, Associate VP-Business Operations

Jan Corlett, Chief of Staff, Academic Affairs

Mary Croughan, Executive Director, Research Grants Program Office

Kathleen Erwin, Director, UC Grants

University-wide Research Funding Principles, Process and Assessment

Contents

- I. Report Overview 1
- II. Rationale for Investment in Systemwide Research..... 1
 - 1. Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC’s influence and advantage..... 2
 - 2. Principle #2: Promote efficient inter-campus collaborations and systemwide economies of scale..... 2
 - 3. Principle #3: Serve the State of California. 2
- III. Proposed Process for Systemwide Research Funding 2
 - A. Glossary of Terms..... 2
 - B. Background, Objectives and Scope 2
 - C. General Constraints and Requirements 3
 - 1. Availability of Funding 3
 - 2. Eligibility of Programs or Initiatives for Systemwide Funding..... 3
 - 3. Applicability of the Proposed Process 3
 - D. Description of Proposed Processes 3
 - 1. Roles and Responsibilities..... 3
 - 2. Group Recommendations..... 4
 - 3. Program Assessments and Evaluation 4
- IV. Assessment Framework 4
 - Appendix A: Recommended UC Portfolio Review Group Charge 7
 - Portfolio Review Group Membership 7
 - Portfolio Review Group Officers 8
 - Portfolio Review Group Officers 8
 - Responsibilities of Portfolio Review Group Officers 8
 - Meetings 8

I. Report Overview

The UC Office of the President (UCOP) provides limited funds to support UC-wide programs and initiatives across all fields of scholarship that might benefit from collaborative work. These UC-wide investments can range from small initiatives that reach across campuses to combine ideas, expertise or resources, to large shared-infrastructure projects that can leverage UC's influence and resources to benefit research throughout the system. With ten campuses, five medical centers, and over twenty-five thousand faculty and research employees, UC can launch and advance unique research efforts that extend well beyond a single campus or university's capabilities.

To help guide UC-wide research investments and ensure these systemwide funds are successful in advancing the University's research goals, it is incumbent upon UCOP to establish a mature framework to carefully evaluate both the overall and relative merits of its investments, and to help make decisions and plans for any future university-wide research initiatives.

The purpose of this document is to detail the principles, process and metrics for assessment that will guide the investment of university-wide resources in research at the University of California. This includes:

1. Providing **clear guiding principles** to:
 - Define the purpose and scope of systemwide research funding, and
 - Describe the benefits of systemwide research funding and how its purpose differs from campus-funded research objectives.
 - This document will NOT recommend specific areas for university-wide funding.
2. Defining a **rigorous process** to guide and periodically review UC-wide research investments, in order to:
 - Evaluate new opportunities, and
 - Decide which UC-wide research programs to initiate or continue, and
 - Determine when and how to transition programs to other sources of funding, in order to allow room for new investments.
 - This document will NOT recommend specific programs or projects for funding or for elimination.
3. Identifying a list of high-level **objectives and measures**, both quantitative and qualitative, by which UCOP can assess (and compare) any UC-wide or multicampus program, initiative or investment. If successful, a well-implemented assessment framework will provide the following benefits:
 - Provide mandatory and comprehensive assessments of UC-wide research which can be compared across all disciplines;
 - Provide transparency and accountability for systemwide expenditures on research;
 - Provide practical information and benchmarks for programs seeking systemwide funding;
 - Inform systemwide funding allocations, budgeting and strategic planning;
 - Advance programs that deliver benefits to the UC system and to California above and beyond what a single campus can accomplish.

II. Rationale for Investment in Systemwide Research

Each UC campus has a unique and competitive research enterprise that is responsive to its faculty and students, and to its sponsors and stakeholders in research. What do UC-wide research investments have to add to these campus

investments, and how do they differ from what is funded by the campuses directly? In addition to the objective of supporting research of the highest quality and impact, the following three principles define the goals and purpose that drive and distinguish UC-wide research investments.

1. Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC's influence and advantage.

With ten campuses, three national laboratories, state-wide resources and networks, the UC system offers researchers access to opportunities and a competitive advantage that a single campus cannot provide on its own. Acting as a network of multiple campuses, UC can invest in efforts that bring the best and most diverse minds together to define challenges, secure funding, and solve significant problems. This provides more opportunities for UC's world-class faculty and creates larger and stronger collaborative resources and networks that can enhance the entire research community.

2. Principle #2: Promote efficient inter-campus collaborations and systemwide economies of scale.

Finding ways for UC researchers and administrators to cross campus boundaries and work together effectively is a key goal of UC-wide investments. Not only does this generate energy and ideas among UC researchers across the system, but it leads to shared innovation and efficiencies in how we conduct and manage research, resulting in savings or financial gains that can be reinvested in UC-wide research.

3. Principle #3: Serve the State of California.

As California's research university, we implement research on behalf of the state in a fair and impartial basis. UC research has a unique capability to address many of the greatest challenges facing California today. UC seeks to create and grow industries that support California regional economies and to educate a culturally literate, knowledgeable workforce that will continue to lead the growth of California and optimize the State's return on its investment in UC.

III. Proposed Process for Systemwide Research Funding

A. Glossary of Terms

- The **Systemwide Research Portfolio** describes all research and graduate research efforts funded through the UC Office of the President.
- A **Program** is a coordinated set of projects undertaking related research or fulfilling a common theme such as multi-campus research.
- An **Initiative** is a research effort that is limited in time or scope. Initiatives may become Programs if they become funded on an extended basis.
- A **Project** describes a time-limited, focused research undertaking, generally funded by a research grant.

B. Background, Objectives and Scope

The UC Office of the President (UCOP) provides limited systemwide funds for the support of UC-wide research programs and initiatives. These investments range in size from small seed funds that encourage planning or networking in new or emerging fields, to larger development grants that can launch or develop successful collaborations or initiatives, to multi-million dollar investments over multiple years that support large-scale initiatives or shared-infrastructure projects that can benefit research throughout the system. Each investment may differ widely in scope, scale and objectives, as well as in fields of research or levels of campus involvement. These investments should align with the Principles outlined in Section II above.

UCOP manages several research programs directly. Other funds are sent directly to UC campuses and managed by local programs. For these campus-managed funds, UCOP maintains an obligation for regular program oversight and review.

The following sections propose a process to advise the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies on how best to align UC's research investments with the Principles outlined in Section II above, and how to continually assess, adjust and revitalize those investments over time.

C. General Constraints and Requirements

1. Availability of Funding

Commitment of systemwide funds to support UC-wide research programs and projects is contingent upon availability of resources. UCOP will determine availability of systemwide funds on an annual basis.

2. Eligibility of Programs or Initiatives for Systemwide Funding

In order to qualify for systemwide research funds, programs and initiatives should preferably:

- Exemplify at least two of the principles of UC-wide research outlined in this document; and
- Demonstrate meaningful collaborations between UC campuses or affiliated national labs. See assessment for additional details on collaborations.

3. Applicability of the Proposed Process

The process proposed below will apply to all research and graduate research efforts which receive funding through the UC Office of the President.

D. Description of Proposed Processes

1. Roles and Responsibilities

The **Vice President** of Research and Graduate Studies has oversight for systemwide-funded programs and initiatives, and advises the President on the effectiveness of those research investments in promoting the overall quality and welfare of UC research.

To assist the Vice President in maintaining a vital and dynamic systemwide research portfolio, the Vice President will convene a **Portfolio Review Group** (PRG) to advise him or her on the size, shape and quality of current UC-wide research investments, and make recommendations for new priorities or directions. See **Appendix A** for a proposed charge which includes details on the group's role and operations, and a discussion of its make-up and governance.

The PRG will be asked to carefully review materials on the systemwide research portfolio and individual programs and initiatives. Materials will be assembled by UCOP staff from internal and external sources, and from information provided by the programs. The PRG may request additional information or input, as needed. Materials may include:

- Summaries of systemwide research investments prepared by UCOP analysts;
- Annual reports or program evaluations, issued by programs or initiatives;
- Reports from External Reviews (when applicable);
- White papers (internal or external to UC) analyzing or forecasting the potential for new areas of research;
- Other materials or information, as needed.

Directors of systemwide-funded programs and initiatives are responsible for providing annual reports to the Vice President, describing the financial vitality, scientific quality of the program, key program goals and accomplishments and how the program or initiative demonstrates the three Systemwide Research Principles (see Section II). Programs may be subject to a periodic external review, depending upon the size and nature of the investment.

2. Group Recommendations

Portfolio Review Group recommendations will be used throughout the year to guide the Vice President in making fair and transparent recommendations and funding decisions, and will assist program directors in the strategic planning and management of their programs.

Recommendations will help guide:

- The development of requests for proposals for current or new funding opportunities;
- Levels of investment in current programs and initiatives;
- The assessment of new funding opportunities or investments when funds become available.

3. Program Assessments and Evaluation

Systemwide Research Portfolio Review. All ongoing funding commitments will be reviewed on an annual basis by the Portfolio Review Group to ensure that investments are aligned with systemwide funding principles (detailed in Section II) and that the systemwide research portfolio is well-balanced according to its size and focus of funding.

Programs must provide an annual report, describing the full program budget, sources of funding, scientific quality of the program, key program goals and accomplishments and how the program or initiative demonstrates the three UC-wide Research Principles (see Section II). Supplementary information may be requested by the Portfolio Review Group.

Individual Program Review. Programs receiving ongoing funding will also be rigorously reviewed once every five years by a panel of experts in a two stage process.

During the first stage, a Scientific Review Committee will evaluate the quality of the science or the quality of the research produced. Maintaining high quality science or research is a minimal requirement for continued inclusion in the UCOP Research Portfolio.

In the second stage, the Portfolio Review Group will review the program to: (a) assess whether the program is meeting all systemwide requirements; (b) consider how well aligned programs goals and accomplishments are with systemwide funding principles, and (c) determine the opportunity cost of continuing ongoing funding commitments.

Areas of Priority for Future Research Funding. In addition to reviewing ongoing funding commitments, the PRG will be asked to assess new research opportunities or directions for funding. This includes assessing the opportunity cost of current research investments against new proposals, and making recommendations to help guide new investments. The PRG may make recommendations to fund specific emerging or critical fields of research, research types or categories requiring more support (such as graduate studies or research computing), or specific programs where appropriate. Whenever possible, the PRG will be asked to rank these priorities.

IV. Assessment Framework

Available systemwide funding can only support a small fraction of the world-class projects that could be conducted in each of the program areas. This oversubscription of available systemwide funds creates a system of healthy competition between the programs within the overall UC-wide research portfolio. The Portfolio Review Group will use a set of objectives and measures to assess and compare UC-wide or multicampus programs, initiatives or investments to support the most competitive programs that best contribute to systemwide objectives. This assessment will recognize the variety of sizes, goals, strategies, activities and fields of research within each program.

Defining Review Criteria and Metrics. UCOP and the Portfolio Review Group will work closely with each program to define a rigorous set of criteria and metrics that can clearly demonstrate how the program’s funded activities contribute to systemwide objectives and how these measurements demonstrate the program’s success in achieving systemwide principles.

- Define the specific goals and criteria which may apply to the program and “map to” the principles of UC-wide research,
- Define how the program’s funded activities “map to” or demonstrate performance against each of these goals and criteria;
- Define which specific metrics will be provided to the review panel to demonstrate that performance.

The primary goal of these metrics will be to demonstrate (both quantitatively and qualitatively) how well a program or initiative delivers against the principles of UC-wide research. While good management and scientific achievements may be key factors in a program’s success, these are baseline requirements for any systemwide investment and will only be considered in relation to how well they demonstrate a program’s achievements towards one or more of the UC-wide research principles.

Areas of Focus. Questions, concerns, or specific areas of focus for the review will be solicited from the Chancellors, the Council of Vice Chancellors for Research, the Academic Senate, Institute Directors, key program stakeholders, the Portfolio Review Group, and the external review panel (when applicable). These areas of focus should be directly addressed in the review criteria and metrics, as well as in the materials provided to the Portfolio Review Group and the external review panel.

Benchmarking Performance. Wherever possible, programs, initiatives, and projects should benchmark their performance against comparable institutions within UC or at other academic institutions. Programs, initiatives, and projects may also choose to provide trend data, benchmarking performance in specific areas across time. All programs, initiatives, and projects committed to continual self-evaluation and improvement should have developed strong metrics for internal use to measure and benchmark their own performance. However, in the event that a program under review does not have readily identified benchmarking data, the Portfolio Review Group and the external review panel (when applicable) may suggest some options. These options will be evaluated for feasible inclusion in the current review, and may be required for future evaluations.

Evaluation. Based on the metrics and materials defined jointly by UCOP, the program, and the Portfolio Review Group, the PRG would rate a program’s performance against each systemwide objective.

Principle-Guided Assessment Framework. Defining a strong assessment framework based on UC-wide principles will enable UCOP to benchmark and compare a diverse set of systemwide investments, and evaluate their performance against a common set of systemwide goals. Specific review criteria and metrics can be flexible, allowing programs to demonstrate – both quantitatively and qualitatively – the diverse activities and accomplishments of each program. However, the goals themselves should remain constant across programs, mapping the review criteria back to UC-wide principles for research investments. The basic structure mapping the principles to goals and review criteria can be seen below:

- *Principle #1: Act as one system of multiple campuses to enhance UC’s influence and advantage.*
 - Goal: Provide UC faculty and students with access to unique facilities or resources that set UC apart.
 - The benchmarking of resources or facilities against similar efforts, resources or facilities.
 - The demonstration of broad access, participation, usage and/or support from UC faculty and students systemwide.

- The demonstration of how funded programs have helped to attract faculty, technical staff, and students systemwide. Special note should be made of efforts to assist with campus faculty recruitment and retention.
 - The demonstration of how funded programs have helped increase UC's competitiveness in other arenas: e.g., by improving academic program rankings, increasing public engagement and support for UC, developing unique and valuable relationships with external parties, etc.
 - Goal: Enable, where available, successful competition for large research projects and grants that single campuses could not access, shown by:
 - The demonstration of how investment by the State and UCOP in the funded program is used to maximize opportunities for external funding.
- *Principle #2: Promote efficient inter-campus collaborations and systemwide economies of scale.*
 - Goal: Efficient operation of shared research facilities, which can be demonstrated by:
 - The benchmarking of basic operations costs against similar facilities.
 - The demonstration of the access and value provided to faculty, students and the research community.
 - Goal: Demonstrate systemwide engagement through long-range planning, transparent governance, reporting and accountability, characterized by:
 - The development of a long-term strategic plan used to guide future research direction.
 - The involvement of key constituents in the strategic planning process, and the clear communication of the strategic plan to staff and key stakeholders.
 - Regular assessment of strategic priorities and adjustment of these priorities as necessary.
 - An engaged governance and advisory structure.
 - An open and transparent program administration, which includes clearly communicating performance and direction to academic partners and the provision of more detailed administrative and fiscal information to appropriate oversight structures.
- *Principle #3: Serve the State of California*
 - Goal: Collectively impact Californians through research at multiple campuses in multiple regions of the state, demonstrated by:
 - An assessment of the program's contribution to the University's research mission.
 - An assessment of the economic, cultural, and societal benefits brought to multiple regions in California resulting from program activity.
 - An assessment of the program's ability to actively engage and inform the California public.

Appendix A: Recommended UC Portfolio Review Group Charge

The UC Office of the President currently invests in various UC-wide research programs and facilities to serve systemwide needs and take advantage of UC's wide distribution of talent for addressing emerging research areas of scale. The amount of this investment fluctuates owing to changes in the UC budget. To ensure that the total amount is optimally spent to provide the best support for UC UC-wide research, UCOP will establish the **Portfolio Review Group (PRG)**. The purpose of the **Portfolio Review Group** is to:

- 1) Provide guidance to the **Vice President** for Research and Graduate Studies on the size, shape and quality of current UC research investments. Assess the systemwide research portfolio to ensure that investments are aligned with systemwide funding principles and that the systemwide research portfolio is well-balanced according to its size and focus of funding.
- 2) Provide recommendations to guide the Vice President in making fair and transparent funding decisions, and assist program directors in the strategic planning and management of their programs.
- 3) Recommend opportunities for new investments in systemwide research to strengthen or balance the research portfolio.

The Portfolio Review Group will provide written reports to the Vice President for Research and Graduate Studies at UCOP. The recommendations will be made available to the UC community to ensure transparency in decisions about systemwide research funding.

The PRG will meet on an annual basis to review the UC-wide research investment portfolio, assess its alignment to the three principles, and make recommendations to the Vice President on research priorities for the upcoming three to five years. The Vice President may also call on the PRG throughout the year for advice on specific research funding issues.

The PRG will be asked to make recommendations on:

- **Areas of Priority for Future Research Funding.** The PRG will be asked to assess the quality and vitality of current research investments against the potential for new opportunities or directions, and make recommendations to help guide new investments. These recommendations could be for specific emerging or critical fields of research, for types or categories of research that require more support (such as graduate studies or research computing), or specific programs, where appropriate. Where possible, the PRG will be asked to rank these priorities. The PRG may recommend or establish a UC-wide task force to carry out strategic planning for UC-wide research.
- **Programs to Continue, Transition or Sunset.** The PRG will also be asked to help identify programs that may be appropriate to sunset or transition to other funds. These may include: (a) programs that are not well-aligned with UC-wide goals (see Principles in Section II above); (b) programs that are less cost-effective at meeting UC-wide goals than other investments; or (c) well-established programs that have outgrown the need for systemwide funding.
- **Guidance on the direction of specific programs or funds.** Where appropriate, and on a limited basis, the PRG will be asked to provide guidance or advice on the direction, alignment, or use of systemwide funds within specific programs. These recommendations are primarily to provide feedback on specific concerns or opportunities related to these programs, and to advise the Vice President and program directors on how to best address these.

Portfolio Review Group Membership

- A. Members will be appointed by the Vice President from a slate of nominees drawn from UC faculty from across the UC system, administrators from the campuses and UCOP; and individuals not employed by UC (External), as deemed necessary by the Vice President.

- B. The Vice President will select administrators and external members with nominations from campus chancellors, taking into account representation of a broad range of roles and academic disciplines on the PRG by current and prospective members.
- C. At least three Vice Chancellors of Research (VCR) from UC campuses will be members of the PRG, with staggered terms so that one new VCR will rotate on each year.
- D. Nominations for Academic Senate faculty will be provided by the Chair of the systemwide Academic Senate to the Vice President.
- E. Academic Senate Faculty will comprise at least half of the UC internal membership.
- F. The period of membership will be three (3) years. There is no specific limit on the number of times a member may be reappointed. However, each individual reappointment will be subject to the approval of the Vice President, and the candidate's acceptance of the new term.

Portfolio Review Group Officers

- A. Group officers shall be a Chair and a Vice Chair, both of whom are current PRG members.
- G. Officers shall be invited to serve by the Vice President, who will provide the PRG with its charge. The Vice Chair, after a year of service will be invited to advance into the Chair role..

Portfolio Review Group Officers

- B. Group officers shall be a Chair and a Vice Chair, both of whom are current PRG members.
- C. Officers shall be invited to serve by the Vice President, who will provide the PRG with its charge. The Vice Chair, after a year of service will be invited to advance into the Chair role.

Responsibilities of Portfolio Review Group Officers

The **PRG Chair** shall, in consultation with the Vice President, determine the agenda for, convene, and preside over all meetings. The Chair shall work with UCOP staff to assure that reasonable notice of meetings is provided to the general membership.

The **PRG Vice Chair** shall assume the duties of the Chair in the Chair's absence.

Meetings

Regular meetings shall be held once a year. Additional meetings may be called, as needed. A regular meeting quorum shall consist of a minimum of one half of general members.